

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-17 and 20-52 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-17 and 20-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In the July 12 Office Action, it was asserted that the term “highly compressed” renders the claim indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed in the Specification at p. 4, lines 17-20, the highly compressed content pieces refer to versions of portions of content 104 that are created in a manner so that the highly compressed form cannot be decompressed into an intelligible form yet can be compared to uncompressed content for equality with a high degree of accuracy. For example, if the highly compressed content piece for a particular song were to be audibly rendered, it would sound noticeably different from the playback of the song. Additional descriptions of this highly compressed content can be found in the Specification at p. 8, line 23 – p. 11, line 12.

As discussed in MPEP §2173.02, the essential inquiry pertaining to this requirement is whether the claims set out and circumscribe a particular subject matter with a reasonable degree of clarity and particularity. Definiteness of claim language must be analyzed, not in a vacuum, but in light of:

(A) The content of the particular application disclosure;

(B) The teachings of the prior art; and

(C) The claim interpretation that would be given by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made.

Additionally, as discussed in MPEP §2173.05(b), the fact that claim language, including terms of degree, may not be precise, does not automatically render the claim indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *Seattle Box Co., v. Industrial Crating & Packing, Inc.*, 731 F.2d 818, 221 USPQ 568 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Acceptability of the claim language depends on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed, in light of the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed, in light of the specification, as discussed above. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17 and 20-52 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

With respect to claim 6, in the July 12 Office Action, it was asserted that the term “audio/video” renders the claim indefinite. As part of this response, claim 6 has been amended to clarify the language of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 6 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 46-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. As part of this response, claims 46-52 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 46-52 comply with 35 U.S.C. §101, and respectfully requests that the §101 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 11-15, 29-36, and 38-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0051996 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter “Cooper”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, 11-15, 29-36, and 38-52 are allowable over Cooper.

Cooper is directed to a network-based content distribution system (see, Title). In Cooper, a Copyright Registry System allows artists, copyright owners, and other content owners to register their valuable digital content (see, ¶ 94). A consumer requests that a content file be registered (see, ¶ 98), and a Copyright Registration System website issues a new and unique digital certificate or unique message for the content file (see, ¶ 100). The Copyright Registry System website also watermarks each content file with a serial number or message for each new and unique digital certificate issued (see, ¶ 101). The watermarked copy of the user’s content can be distributed over a network, and the digital certificate or message is generated to prove the authenticity of the person who filed with the Copyright Registry (see, ¶¶ 119-120). A player of content can check the Content Registry system to see if an identical digital certificate is being played by another player device (see, ¶ 124). If there is no match (no identical digital certificate in the Content Registry system), then the content file plays normally (see, ¶ 124).

With respect to amended claim 1, amended claim 1 recites:

A system comprising:
a source database storing a plurality of highly compressed
content pieces; and
a content player, coupled to the source database, including,
an interface to receive a subset of the plurality of
highly compressed content pieces from the source database,
a storage device to store the subset,

a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset,

a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, the particular action comprising contacting a remote device to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces, and

an output controller to render the content if the comparator indicates the content does not match any of the highly compressed content pieces in the subset.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed in Cooper.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Cooper of a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, the particular action comprising contacting a remote device to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces as recited in amended claim 1. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper cannot disclose the system of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, in the system of amended claim 1 the content player includes a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset. Thus, the comparison is performed at the content player in the system of amended claim 1, not elsewhere. Cooper, on the other hand, discusses checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124), not performing a comparison on a content player as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that Cooper does not disclose the comparator of amended claim 1, and thus cannot disclose the system of amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Cooper.

With respect to claims 2-8 and 11-15, given that claims 2-8 and 11-15 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-8 and 11-15 are likewise allowable over Cooper for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

With respect to amended claim 29, amended claim 29 recites:

A method implemented in a device, the method comprising:
comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content;
determining whether the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces;
taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, the programmed action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content; and
playing back the content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed in Cooper.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Cooper of taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, the programmed action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content as recited in amended claim 29. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper cannot disclose the method of amended claim 29.

Furthermore, the method of amended claim 29 is implemented in a device, and that method includes comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content. Thus, the comparison is performed at the same device as the determining, taking, and playing of amended claim 29, not elsewhere. Cooper, on the other hand, discusses checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124), not performing a comparison on the same device where playing back of the content occurs as recited in amended claim 29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper does not disclose the comparing of amended claim 29, and thus cannot disclose the system of amended claim 29.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 29 is allowable over Cooper.

With respect to claims 30-36 and 38-39, given that claims 30-36 and 38-39 depend from amended claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30-36 and 38-39 are likewise allowable over Cooper for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 29.

With respect to amended claim 40, amended claim 40 recites:

One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor of a device to perform a method comprising:

comparing, at the device, a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content;

determining whether the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces;

checking, if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, whether a valid license for the media content is present at the device; and

rendering the media content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable memories are disclosed in Cooper.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Cooper of checking, if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, whether a valid license for the media content is present at the device, as recited in amended claim 40. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper cannot disclose the computer-readable memories of amended claim 40.

Furthermore, in amended claim 40 the comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content is performed on the same device as the rendering the media content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces. Cooper, on the other hand, discusses checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124), not performing a comparison on the same device where rendering of the media content occurs as recited in amended claim 40. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper does not disclose the comparing of amended claim 40, and thus that Cooper cannot disclose the system of amended claim 40.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 40 is allowable over Cooper.

With respect to amended claim 41, amended claim 41 recites:

A device comprising:
means for storing a set of highly compressed content pieces;
means for determining, at the device, whether a portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces;
means for taking a particular action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces, the particular action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content; and
means for playing back the content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such device is disclosed in Cooper.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Cooper of means for taking a particular action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces, the particular action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content as recited in amended claim 41. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper cannot disclose the device of amended claim 41.

Furthermore, in amended claim 41, the same device includes the means for determining whether a portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces and the means for playing back the content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces. Thus, the determining is performed at the same device as the playing back of the content, not elsewhere. Cooper, on the other hand, discusses checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124), not

determining whether a portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces on the same device where playing back of the content occurs as recited in amended claim 41. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper does not disclose the means for determining of amended claim 41, and thus that Cooper cannot disclose the device of amended claim 41.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 41 is allowable over Cooper.

With respect to claims 42-45, given that claims 42-45 depend from amended claim 41, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 42-45 are likewise allowable over Cooper for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 41.

With respect to amended claim 46, amended claim 46 recites:

One or more computer storage media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors of a computer, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

checking, at the computer, whether a portion of media content matches a piece of highly compressed content, wherein the piece of highly compressed content cannot be played back to a user in an intelligible form;

allowing the portion of media content to be played back if the portion of media content does not match the piece of highly compressed content; and

taking a particular action if the portion of media content does match the piece of highly compressed content, wherein the particular action comprises obtaining an additional piece of highly compressed content in order to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the media content matches the piece of highly compressed content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer storage media is disclosed in Cooper.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Cooper of taking a particular action if the portion of media content does match the piece of highly compressed content, wherein the particular action comprises obtaining an additional piece of highly compressed content in order to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the media content matches the piece of highly compressed content as recited in amended claim 46. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper cannot disclose the computer storage media of amended claim 46.

Furthermore, in amended claim 46 the checking whether a portion of media content matches a piece of highly compressed content is performed on the same computer as the allowing the portion of media content to be played back. Cooper, on the other hand, discusses checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124), not checking whether a portion of media content matches a piece of highly compressed content on the same computer where playback of the media content occurs as recited in amended claim 46. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper does not disclose the checking of amended claim 46, and thus that Cooper cannot disclose the computer storage media of amended claim 46.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 46 is allowable over Cooper.

With respect to claims 47-52, given that claims 47-52 depend from amended claim 46, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 47-52 are likewise

allowable over Cooper for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 46.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-10, 16-17, 20-28, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,390,297 to Barber et al. (hereinafter “Barber”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-10, 16-17, 20-28, and 37 are not obvious over Cooper in view of Barber.

Barber is directed to a system for controlling the number of concurrent copies of a program in a network based on the number of available licenses (see, Title). As discussed in the Abstract of Barber, license management systems and methods allow licenses for a computer program to be available for use at each of a plurality of nodes of a network. If a valid license file at a local node contains an unexpired, available license, a license manager at the local node permits the computer program to be executed at the requesting local node. If no such license is available in a valid license file at such local node, the license manager searches the other nodes for a valid license file containing an unexpired, available license. In one embodiment, if an unexpired available license is located in a valid license file at a second (or “remote”) node, the license manager transfers such license to the local node, and assigns and encrypts a unique identification to such transferred license. The original record of the transferred license is modified by erasing it from the license file at the remote node so that the transferred license is no longer available there. In a second embodiment, the license manager modifies the license

file to indicate use of the license at the local node without such transfer. The number of copies of the computer program that are authorized for execution simultaneously on the network is thus limited to the number of licenses that have been loaded into the license files on the network.

With respect to claim 9, claim 9 recites:

A system comprising:
a source database storing a plurality of highly compressed content pieces; and
a content player, coupled to the source database, including,
an interface to receive a subset of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces from the source database,
a storage device to store the subset,
a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, and
a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset,
wherein the storage device is further to store a plurality of licenses identifying content that a user of the content player is authorized to playback, and wherein the particular action comprises the resolver checking whether one of the plurality of licenses corresponds to the content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer storage media is disclosed or suggested by Cooper in view of Barber.

In the system of claim 9, the content player includes a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset. Thus, the comparison is performed at the content player in the system of claim 9, not elsewhere. In contrast, Cooper discusses performing checking the Copyright Registry 234 to see if someone else is using the same software program with the

same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124). Thus, the checking in Cooper is performed at the Copyright Registry 234, not at the player of content.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of performing the checking of Cooper at the player of content. The Copyright Registry 234 of Cooper checks to see if someone else is using the same software program with the same digital certificate (see, ¶ 124). If the checking of Cooper were performed at the player of content rather than the Copyright Registry 234, it would mean all of the different players of content in Cooper would need to know what software programs with what digital certificates all of the other players of content are using. Such a system would be burdensome and impractical, and accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion of performing such checking at the player of content.

Thus, as there is no disclosure or suggestion of performing the checking of Cooper on a content player, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper does not disclose or suggest the system of claim 9.

With respect to Barber, Barber is not cited as curing and does not cure these deficiencies of Cooper. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over Cooper in view of Barber.

With respect to claim 10, given that claim 10 depends from claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is likewise allowable over Cooper in view of Barber for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9.

With respect to amended claim 16, amended claim 16 recites:

A device comprising:
a memory to store one or more highly compressed content pieces;

a comparator, coupled to the memory, to compare the one or more highly compressed content pieces to content at the device and to determine whether the content matches at least one of the one or more highly compressed content pieces; and

a resolver, coupled to the comparator, to take a particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, wherein the particular action comprises checking to see whether the device has a valid license for the content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such device is disclosed or suggested by Cooper in view of Barber.

In amended claim 16, the comparator is to compare the one or more highly compressed content pieces to content at the device and to determine whether the content matches at least one of the one or more highly compressed content pieces. Similar to the discussion above regarding claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper in view of Barber does not disclose the same device having the content and performing the comparison of the one or more highly compressed content pieces to the content at the device as recited in amended claim 16. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 16 is allowable over Cooper in view of Barber.

With respect to claims 17 and 20-28, given that claims 17 and 20-28 depend from amended claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 20-28 are likewise allowable over Cooper in view of Barber for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 16.

With respect to amended claim 37, amended claim 37 recites:

A method implemented in a content player, the method comprising:

comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content;

determining whether the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces; and

taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, wherein the programmed action comprises checking whether one of a plurality of licenses maintained at a content player performing the comparing corresponds to the portion of media content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed or suggested by Cooper in view of Barber.

In amended claim 37, the comparing and the taking are implemented in the same content player. Similar to the discussion above regarding claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Cooper in view of Barber does not disclose the same content player comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content and taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, wherein the programmed action comprises checking whether one of a plurality of licenses maintained at a content player performing the comparing corresponds to the portion of media content as recited in amended claim 37. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 37 is allowable over Cooper in view of Barber.

Claims 1-3, 7, 29, 32, 34-35, 40-41, and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,686 to Edwards et al. (hereinafter “Edwards”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 7, 29, 32, 34-35, 40-41, and 45-46 are not obvious over Edwards.

Edwards is directed to obtaining user responses in a virtual execution environment (see, Title). As discussed in the Abstract of Edwards, Edwards provides for on-access scanning of archives, such as “ZIP” files, for files

containing viruses or other unwanted characteristics. In particular, disclosed are various techniques for beginning a scanning operation, and then monitoring the scanning operation to determine whether it is completing in a reasonable time. If the scanning operation is taking place within a terminal server type of environment, such as the Microsoft Terminal Server, where an application program is run in a virtual execution environment, then provision is made to identify client connections to the server so that error messages (such as denying file access due to a virus) can be presented to a terminal server client's terminal, rather than at the terminal server console.

With respect to amended claim 1, amended claim 1 recites:

A system comprising:
a source database storing a plurality of highly compressed content pieces; and
a content player, coupled to the source database, including,
an interface to receive a subset of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces from the source database,
a storage device to store the subset,
a comparator to compare the subset to content and determine whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset,
a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, the particular action comprising contacting a remote device to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces, and
an output controller to render the content if the comparator indicates the content does not match any of the highly compressed content pieces in the subset.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed or suggested in Edwards.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Edwards of a resolver to take particular action in response to the comparator indicating the content matches one of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces in the subset, the particular action comprising contacting a remote device to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the content matches any of the plurality of highly compressed content pieces as recited in amended claim 1. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Edwards cannot disclose or suggest the system of amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Edwards.

With respect to claims 2, 3, and 7, given that claims 2, 3, and 7 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, and 7 are likewise allowable over Edwards for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

With respect to amended claim 29, amended claim 29 recites:

A method implemented in a device, the method comprising:
comparing a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content;
determining whether the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces;
taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, the programmed action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content; and
playing back the content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed or suggested in Edwards.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Edwards of taking a programmed action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, the programmed action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content as recited in amended claim 29. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Edwards cannot disclose the method of amended claim 29.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 29 is allowable over Edwards.

With respect to claims 32, 34, and 35, given that claims 32, 34, and 35 depend from amended claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32, 34, and 35 are likewise allowable over Edwards for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 29.

With respect to amended claim 40, amended claim 40 recites:

One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor of a device to perform a method comprising:

comparing, at the device, a portion of media content to a set of one or more highly compressed pieces of content;

determining whether the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces;

checking, if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, whether a valid license for the media content is present at the device; and

rendering the media content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable memories are disclosed or suggested in Edwards.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Edwards of checking, if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed pieces, whether a valid license for the media content is present at the device, as recited in amended claim 40. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Edwards cannot disclose or suggest the computer-readable memories of amended claim 40.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 40 is allowable over Edwards.

With respect to amended claim 41, amended claim 41 recites:

A device comprising:
means for storing a set of highly compressed content pieces;
means for determining, at the device, whether a portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces;
means for taking a particular action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces, the particular action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content; and
means for playing back the content if the determining indicates the portion of media content does not match any of the set of highly compressed pieces.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such device is disclosed or suggested in Edwards.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Edwards of means for taking a particular action if the portion of media content matches any of the set of highly compressed content pieces, the particular action comprising notifying a publisher of the media content of the existence of pirated content as recited in amended claim 41. Without any such discussion or mention,

Applicant respectfully submits that Edwards cannot disclose or suggest the device of amended claim 41.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 41 is allowable over Edwards.

With respect to claim 45, given that claim 45 depends from amended claim 41, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 45 is likewise allowable over Edwards for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 41.

With respect to amended claim 46, amended claim 46 recites:

One or more computer storage media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors of a computer, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

checking, at the computer, whether a portion of media content matches a piece of highly compressed content, wherein the piece of highly compressed content cannot be played back to a user in an intelligible form;

allowing the portion of media content to be played back if the portion of media content does not match the piece of highly compressed content; and

taking a particular action if the portion of media content does match the piece of highly compressed content, wherein the particular action comprises obtaining an additional piece of highly compressed content in order to perform a more thorough analysis of whether the media content matches the piece of highly compressed content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer storage media is disclosed or suggested in Edwards.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or mention in Edwards of taking a particular action if the portion of media content does match the piece of highly compressed content, wherein the particular action comprises obtaining an additional piece of highly compressed content in order to perform a

more through analysis of whether the media content matches the piece of highly compressed content as recited in amended claim 46. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Edwards cannot disclose the computer storage media of amended claim 46.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 46 is allowable over Edwards.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-17 and 20-52 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: December 1, 2006

By: /Allan T. Sponseller/
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256